

Essay

On Something from Nothing, Existence of God & Non-Existence of Multiverse

Himangsu S. Pal*

ABSTRACT

In this essay, I will argue that: (1) Something can come from something only and that something can never come from nothing; (2) The property of timelessness of light proves that there is a timeless entity in this universe; and (3) The multiverse theory cannot true if the total energy of the universe is zero.

Key Words: something, nothing, God, existence, light, timeless, spaceless, multiverse.

Can something come from nothing?

Once upon a time there was an atheist who raised a very intelligent question: how can a non-thing have any attributes? Very recently the same question has been asked by a famous American atheist also. We all know that the atheists do not believe in the existence of God. So, as per them God is a non-thing, and therefore this non-existent God, or this non-thing, cannot have any attributes at all. But here I will show that, even if God does not exists, this non-existent God (non-thing) can still have many attributes.

For this purpose, I will take the case of a stone that does not exist, and I will ask the question: can we destroy a non-existent stone? The answer is very simple indeed: no, we cannot. A non-existent stone cannot be destroyed, simply because it does not exist at all. So we can say that a non-existent stone is indestructible. This is one attribute that the non-existent stone can have. Similarly it can be shown that this non-existent stone can have many other attributes also.

The non-existent stone is not within any space, because it does not exist, and therefore it cannot have any space at all. Therefore, it is spaceless.

The non-existent stone is not within any time, because it does not exist, and therefore it cannot have any time at all. Therefore, it is timeless.

As the non-existent stone is neither in space nor in time, so the non-existent stone cannot change at all. This is because change can occur either in space or time. So, the non-existent stone does not get any chance to change at all, and thus the non-existent stone is changeless.

A non-existent stone can never cease to be, because ceasing to be is also some sort of change. And we have already seen that no change can ever occur for the non-existent stone, because

* Correspondence: Himangsu S. Pal. E-Mail: sekharpal1946@rediffmail.com

necessary condition for the occurrence of any sort of change in it does not exist at all. So the non-existent stone will never cease to be. But what does it mean that the non-existent stone will never cease to be? It means that the non-existent stone will forever remain a non-existent stone.

Similarly, it can be shown that the non-existent stone will always be unborn, uncreated, without any beginning and without an end. This is because it has already been made very clear that no change can ever occur for the non-existent stone. But to be born is some sort of change. Being created is also some sort of change. Having a beginning is also some sort of change. Coming to an end is also some sort of change. As the non-existent stone can never change at all, therefore it will always be unborn, uncreated, without any beginning and without an end.

But what does it mean that the non-existent stone is without any beginning and an end? It means that the non-existence of the non-existent stone has never begun, and that the non-existence of the non-existent stone will never come to an end. It means that the non-existence of the non-existent stone is everlasting.

But if the non-existent stone is everlastingly non-existent, it means that it can never come into existence from its everlasting non-existence. It will forever remain into its non-existence. This will further imply that something can come from something only, and that something can never come from nothing.

Easy way to prove that there is a God

We know that at the speed of light time totally stops. With this scanty material in our hand we can easily show that there is indeed a timeless and deathless entity in our universe.

In order to do this, we will have to philosophize a bit here. As hardness is the property of a hard thing, so timelessness is the property of a timeless entity. We cannot think of hardness as separately existing apart from a hard thing. Similarly we cannot think of timelessness as separately existing apart from a timeless entity. So the property of timelessness is an inherent or inalienable property of a timeless entity. The timeless entity will have this property of timelessness by virtue of it being timeless, or simply by default. We need not have to search for any other reason as to how it has acquired its so-called property of timelessness. But it may also be the case that there is some other entity in our universe that will have this property of timelessness, but that will not necessarily be timeless. If we find that there is really such an entity, then the problem arises. Because in that case we cannot say that this entity possesses the property of timelessness simply by default. And we will have to find out as to how that particular entity not being itself timeless can still have the property of timelessness.

But in our universe is there really any such entity that is not timeless, but that still possesses the property of timelessness? Yes, there is, and light is such an entity. Light has the property of timelessness, but light itself is not timeless. Light has the property of timelessness, because at the speed of light time totally stops. But light itself is not timeless, because light does not possess the

most essential property of a timeless entity, which is its everlastingness. A timeless entity will also be immortal, everlasting. It can never cease to be. Death is some sort of change. I am very much alive at this moment. But at the very next moment I may die. But in the world of a timeless entity this very next moment will never arrive, and therefore a timeless entity will never cease to be; it will be everlasting. But we cannot say the same thing about light. We can switch any light bulb on at any time, and we can switch it off at any other time. If light were really timeless, then any light bulb once switched on would have glowed eternally, everlastingly. Our sun has burned for the last 5 billion years, and perhaps it will burn for another 5 billion years. Then one day it will also extinguish. So, although it is true that in case of light time totally stops, yet in spite of that fact we cannot say that light is timeless as well. So, even if we find that light possesses the property of timelessness, still we cannot say that it possesses this property simply by default, and the only conclusion that we can arrive at here is that it must have received this property from some other outside source. But from which outside source can it receive this property? Of course from that source only that will have this property of timelessness. But for having that property the source must have to be timeless, that is, that source must have that property by default only, as otherwise there will be an infinite regress.

So, the property of timelessness of light proves that there is a timeless entity in this universe. As we have seen a timeless entity is also a deathless entity, so we can say that the property of light proves that there is a timeless and deathless entity in this universe.

This may be the only possible explanation that can be given for the so-called property of light. We have been compelled to arrive at this conclusion solely due to the fact that light has the property of timelessness in spite of the fact that itself is not timeless.

If there were things in this universe that were themselves not hard but that were still having the property of hardness, then we would have arrived at the same conclusion about those things also, that all those things had received their property of hardness from a hard thing that would have its property of hardness simply by default. In that case we would also have said: existence of such things in our universe proves the existence of at least one hard thing in our universe. But I think, and I can even say that I am absolutely certain about it, that nobody will be able to cite an example of such a single thing existing in this universe; the exceptional thing having the property of hardness while itself not being hard. In that respect we can even say that light is the only exception of its kind in our universe: an entity having the property of timelessness (hardness) but itself not being timeless (hard).

Can multiverse theory be true if the total energy of the universe is zero?

The first half of the 20th century brought a revolutionary change into our concept about space and time. Earlier it was thought that space and time were having independent existence, and that they were absolute. Even if all the matter disappeared from the universe, space would remain the same and unaffected. Similar view was held about time also, that time flowed in the same way throughout the universe and that this flow did not depend on anything. But with the coming of

Einstein's theory of relativity our concept about space and time has undergone a total and drastic change. Now we have come to know that if there is no matter, then neither will there be any space and time. With the disappearance of matter space and time will also disappear. As there cannot be any space and time without matter, so we can say that the existence of space and time depends on the existence of matter. Now we have also come to know that matter and energy are equivalent. So we can say that the existence of space and time depends on the existence of energy. When there will be energy, there will be space and time as well. Similarly, when there will be space and time, there will have to be some energy associated with that space and time. This is the first point that we will have to remember for our purpose here.

The second point that we will have to remember is that scientists have shown that the total energy of the universe is exactly zero. On the basis of this data scientists generally argue that the universe needs no creator for its coming into existence, and that it can create itself from nothing.

On the basis of these two scientific data, i.e.: 1) that there cannot be any space and time without energy, and 2) that the total energy of the universe is zero, I will now proceed to show as to why the multiverse theory cannot be true.

First of all, I will examine here which condition the universe will have to satisfy in order that it can have zero energy. For this purpose I will assume that as we are placed within the space of the universe, so the universe as a whole is also placed within some higher space. In order to differentiate the outer space within which the universe is placed from the inner space of the universe, we will designate the outer space as the superspace. Although it is called superspace, both the inner space and the outer space are the same. Now I will ask the question: can the universe have zero energy if it is placed within this superspace? Now I have already made it very clear that the superspace is also space, and that therefore it can exist only in case it has some energy associated with it. Now the superspace contains the universe within it, and therefore the universe must have some energy so that the superspace containing the universe can exist at all. Thus we find that if there is space outside the universe, the total energy of the universe cannot be zero.

So, our conclusion is this that, in order that the universe can have zero energy, it cannot have any space at all outside it. This may be the reason as to why multiverse theory may not be true.